

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

LARRY D. REAVES,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAN JOSE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, et
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:14-cv-00602-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00603-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00604-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00609-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00646-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00657-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:14-cv-00673-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00025-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00028-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00048-MMD-VPC
Case No. 3:15-cv-00055-MMD-VPC

ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE
VALERIE P. COOKE

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 3) ("R&R") relating to plaintiff's initiation of forty-seven separate cases in this District. The Defendants include various entities, including the Department of Veteran Affairs, Greyhound Bus Lines, President Obama, the Governor of an unnamed state, Bay Area Rapid Transit ("BART"), Western Union, various local casinos and hotels, state court security guards, both the San Jose and Reno International Airports, the United States Post Office, and many other entities and individuals. No objection to the R&R has been filed.

This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party

timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made); see also *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., *Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to which no objection was filed).

Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cooke's R&R. As discussed in Magistrate Judge Cooke's R&R, in each of plaintiff's cases, the initiating documents are merely nonsensical words and numbers sprawled on pieces of paper, sometimes with a copy of a bus ticket or other receipt of some kind. (See, e.g., 3:14-cv-00617-RCJ-VPC; 3:14-cv-00673-MMD-VPC). Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) states that a complaint must contain a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction, a claim showing that plaintiff is entitled to relief, and the relief sought. Plaintiffs' documents contain mere gibberish, and the sheer number of cases initiated since October 2014 are a clear indication that plaintiff's claims, even if they were clearly articulated, would likely be based on conclusions that are untenable. "It is not the court's job to wade through pages of incoherent gobbledegook in search of a single claim that may have merit." *Shalla! v.*

1 Gates, 254 F.R.D. 140, 143 n. 6 (D.D.C. 2008). Upon reviewing the R&R and the
2 filings in Plaintiffs' cases, this Court finds good cause to accept and adopt the Magistrate
3 Judge's R&R in full.

4 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
5 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 3) is accepted and
6 adopted in its entirety.

7 It is further ordered that each of plaintiff's complaints listed above is dismissed
8 with prejudice.

9 The Clerk is directed to close this case.

10 DATED THIS 27th day of April 2015.
11

12 
13 MIRANDA M. DU
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28